

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20508

970095

IB DOCKET

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

FEB 19 4 15 PM '97 96-111
2 1997

DOCKET FILE

Mr. Kenneth Gross
President and Chief Operating Officer
Columbia Communications
7200 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.
Suite 701
Bethesda, Maryland 20814

RECEIVED

FEB 12 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Dear Mr. Gross:

I am writing in reply to a letter of January 31, 1997, from your legal counsel, regarding the negotiations on basic telecommunications services at the World Trade Organization. The U.S. goal in these negotiations is to strengthen the ability of the U.S. satellite services industry to compete globally, and on a level playing field, with the inter-governmental satellite services organizations and with satellite service providers of other countries.

The United States has taken a number of steps to make certain that our key trade partners provide market access for satellite-based delivery of basic telecom services. Based on a note issued by the chairman of the negotiations in November, 1996, which has become part of the formal record of the proceedings, we have clarified the scheduling approach with regard to satellites. As a result, close to forty countries have made offers that would provide full market access for satellite-based delivery of all scheduled services, on an immediate or phased-in basis.

WTO members that make specific commitments on satellites will be subject to allocating and assigning frequencies in accordance with the principles of most-favored-nation and national treatment, as well as in accordance with the requirement for domestic regulations in the General Agreement on Trade in Services. Almost all of the countries making full satellite commitments have also adopted the reference paper on pro-competitive regulatory commitments. As a result, they will be obligated to provide additional regulatory safeguards with respect to allocation and use of radio frequencies.

A successful agreement on basic telecom services would also obligate those countries which have not made satellite commitments to provide treatment no less favorable to satellite service providers of the United States than the treatment provided to service suppliers of other countries. This would apply, for example, to how WTO members reach decisions regarding new market access arrangements involving service suppliers of other countries.

I share your deep concern regarding the possible distortive impact on competition in the U.S. satellite services market of certain proposals for restructuring INTELSAT. The United States has proposed a restructuring of INTELSAT that would lead to the creation of an independent commercial affiliate, INTELSAT New Corporation (INC). If made independent, the United

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

04

States believes that the creation of INC will enhance competition and help ensure the continuation of INTELSAT's mission of global connectivity for core services. As you are aware, however, many INTELSAT members are resisting the idea of independence for INC and we believe that a failure to achieve independence could adversely affect competition in the U.S. satellite services market. In the WTO negotiations we have taken pains to preserve our ability to protect competition in the U.S. market.

Our legal conclusion, for which there is a consensus among participants in the WTO negotiations, is that the ISOs do not derive any benefits from a GBT agreement because of their status as treaty-based organizations. The status of ISOs was discussed in detail in the GBT multilateral sessions. No delegation in the GBT negotiations has contested this conclusion.


We have also concluded that the United States cannot be forced to grant a license to a privatized ISO (should the ISO change its treaty status and incorporate in a country) or to a future privatized affiliate, subsidiary or other form of spin-off from the ISO. Existing U.S. communications and antitrust law, regulation, policy and practice will continue to apply to license applicants if a GBT deal goes into effect. Both Department of Justice and FCC precedent evidence long-standing concerns about competition in the U.S. market and actions to protect that competition. We have made it clear to all our negotiating partners in the WTO that the United States will not grant market access to a future privatized affiliate, subsidiary or other form of spin-off from the ISOs, that would likely lead to anti-competitive results.

It has always been U.S. practice to defend vigorously any challenge in the WTO to allegations that U.S. measures are inconsistent with our WTO obligations. There is no question that we would do the same for any FCC decision to deny or condition a license to access an ISO or a future privatized affiliate, subsidiary or other form of spin-off from the ISO. For your information, Section 102(c) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, specifically denies a private right of action in U.S. courts on the basis of a WTO agreement. Therefore, a FCC decision is not subject to judicial review in U.S. courts based upon a WTO agreement, such as the General Agreement on Trade in Services.

The United States is confident that it would win if a U.S. decision went to WTO dispute settlement. If the United States did not prevail, however, we would not allow trade retaliation measures to deter us from protecting the integrity of U.S. competition policy.

I appreciate the support your firms' representatives have expressed for our objectives in the WTO negotiations.

Sincerely,



Charlene Barshefsky
United States Trade Representative-Designate

cc: Chairman Reed Hundt, Federal Communications Commission

FCC Secretary William F. Caton for inclusion in the rulemaking proceeding concerning the Commission's Regulatory Policies to Allow Non-U.S.-Licensed Space Stations to Provide Domestic and International Satellite Service in the United States (FCC 96-210, released May 14, 1996)

Daniel S. Goldberg, Counsel to PanAmSat

Raul R. Rodriguez, Counsel to Columbia Communications Corporation

April McClain-Delaney, Counsel to Orion Network Systems, Inc.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20508

FEB 12 1997

Mr. Neil Bauer
President and Chief Executive Officer
Orion Network Systems, Inc.
2440 Research Boulevard
Suite 400
Rockville, Maryland 20850

Dear Mr. Bauer:

I am writing in reply to a letter of January 31, 1997, from your legal counsel, regarding the negotiations on basic telecommunications services at the World Trade Organization. The U.S. goal in these negotiations is to strengthen the ability of the U.S. satellite services industry to compete globally, and on a level playing field, with the inter-governmental satellite services organizations and with satellite service providers of other countries.

The United States has taken a number of steps to make certain that our key trade partners provide market access for satellite-based delivery of basic telecom services. Based on a note issued by the chairman of the negotiations in November, 1996, which has become part of the formal record of the proceedings, we have clarified the scheduling approach with regard to satellites. As a result, close to forty countries have made offers that would provide full market access for satellite-based delivery of all scheduled services, on an immediate or phased-in basis.

WTO members that make specific commitments on satellites will be subject to allocating and assigning frequencies in accordance with the principles of most-favored-nation and national treatment, as well as in accordance with the requirement for domestic regulations in the General Agreement on Trade in Services. Almost all of the countries making full satellite commitments have also adopted the reference paper on pro-competitive regulatory commitments. As a result, they will be obligated to provide additional regulatory safeguards with respect to allocation and use of radio frequencies.

A successful agreement on basic telecom services would also obligate those countries which have not made satellite commitments to provide treatment no less favorable to satellite service providers of the United States than the treatment provided to service suppliers of other countries. This would apply, for example, to how WTO members reach decisions regarding new market access arrangements involving service suppliers of other countries.

I share your deep concern regarding the possible distortive impact on competition in the U.S. satellite services market of certain proposals for restructuring INTELSAT. The United States has proposed a restructuring of INTELSAT that would lead to the creation of an independent commercial affiliate, INTELSAT New Corporation (INC). If made independent, the United

States believes that the creation of INC will enhance competition and help ensure the continuation of INTELSAT's mission of global connectivity for core services. As you are aware, however, many INTELSAT members are resisting the idea of independence for INC and we believe that a failure to achieve independence could adversely affect competition in the U.S. satellite services market. In the WTO negotiations we have taken pains to preserve our ability to protect competition in the U.S. market.

Our legal conclusion, for which there is a consensus among participants in the WTO negotiations, is that the ISOs do not derive any benefits from a GBT agreement because of their status as treaty-based organizations. The status of ISOs was discussed in detail in the GBT multilateral sessions. No delegation in the GBT negotiations has contested this conclusion.


We have also concluded that the United States cannot be forced to grant a license to a privatized ISO (should the ISO change its treaty status and incorporate in a country) or to a future privatized affiliate, subsidiary or other form of spin-off from the ISO. Existing U.S. communications and antitrust law, regulation, policy and practice will continue to apply to license applicants if a GBT deal goes into effect. Both Department of Justice and FCC precedent evidence long-standing concerns about competition in the U.S. market and actions to protect that competition. We have made it clear to all our negotiating partners in the WTO that the United States will not grant market access to a future privatized affiliate, subsidiary or other form of spin-off from the ISOs, that would likely lead to anti-competitive results.

It has always been U.S. practice to defend vigorously any challenge in the WTO to allegations that U.S. measures are inconsistent with our WTO obligations. There is no question that we would do the same for any FCC decision to deny or condition a license to access an ISO or a future privatized affiliate, subsidiary or other form of spin-off from the ISO. For your information, Section 102(c) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, specifically denies a private right of action in U.S. courts on the basis of a WTO agreement. Therefore, a FCC decision is not subject to judicial review in U.S. courts based upon a WTO agreement, such as the General Agreement on Trade in Services.

The United States is confident that it would win if a U.S. decision went to WTO dispute settlement. If the United States did not prevail, however, we would not allow trade retaliation measures to deter us from protecting the integrity of U.S. competition policy.

I appreciate the support your firms' representatives have expressed for our objectives in the WTO negotiations.

Sincerely,



Charlene Barshefsky

United States Trade Representative-Designate

cc: Chairman Reed Hundt, Federal Communications Commission

FCC Secretary William F. Caton for inclusion in the rulemaking proceeding concerning the Commission's Regulatory Policies to Allow Non-U.S.-Licensed Space Stations to Provide Domestic and International Satellite Service in the United States (FCC 96-210, released May 14, 1996)

Daniel S. Goldberg, Counsel to PanAmSat

Raul R. Rodriguez, Counsel to Columbia Communications Corporation

April McClain-Delaney, Counsel to Orion Network Systems, Inc.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20508

JAN 12 1997

Mr. Frederick A. Landman
President and Chief Executive Officer
PanAmSat Corporation
1 Pickwick Plaza
Greenwich, Connecticut 06830

Dear Mr. Landman:

I am writing in reply to a letter of January 31, 1997, from your legal counsel, regarding the negotiations on basic telecommunications services at the World Trade Organization. The U.S. goal in these negotiations is to strengthen the ability of the U.S. satellite services industry to compete globally, and on a level playing field, with the inter-governmental satellite services organizations and with satellite service providers of other countries.

The United States has taken a number of steps to make certain that our key trade partners provide market access for satellite-based delivery of basic telecom services. Based on a note issued by the chairman of the negotiations in November, 1996, which has become part of the formal record of the proceedings, we have clarified the scheduling approach with regard to satellites. As a result, close to forty countries have made offers that would provide full market access for satellite-based delivery of all scheduled services, on an immediate or phased-in basis.

WTO members that make specific commitments on satellites will be subject to allocating and assigning frequencies in accordance with the principles of most-favored-nation and national treatment, as well as in accordance with the requirement for domestic regulations in the General Agreement on Trade in Services. Almost all of the countries making full satellite commitments have also adopted the reference paper on pro-competitive regulatory commitments. As a result, they will be obligated to provide additional regulatory safeguards with respect to allocation and use of radio frequencies.

A successful agreement on basic telecom services would also obligate those countries which have not made satellite commitments to provide treatment no less favorable to satellite service providers of the United States than the treatment provided to service suppliers of other countries. This would apply, for example, to how WTO members reach decisions regarding new market access arrangements involving service suppliers of other countries.

I share your deep concern regarding the possible distortive impact on competition in the U.S. satellite services market of certain proposals for restructuring INTELSAT. The United States has proposed a restructuring of INTELSAT that would lead to the creation of an independent commercial affiliate, INTELSAT New Corporation (INC). If made independent, the United States believes that the creation of INC will enhance competition and help ensure the continuation

States believes that the creation of INC will enhance competition and help ensure the continuation of INTELSAT's mission of global connectivity for core services. As you are aware, however, many INTELSAT members are resisting the idea of independence for INC and we believe that a failure to achieve independence could adversely affect competition in the U.S. satellite services market. In the WTO negotiations we have taken pains to preserve our ability to protect competition in the U.S. market.

Our legal conclusion, for which there is a consensus among participants in the WTO negotiations, is that the ISOs do not derive any benefits from a GBT agreement because of their status as treaty-based organizations. The status of ISOs was discussed in detail in the GBT multilateral sessions. No delegation in the GBT negotiations has contested this conclusion.

We have also concluded that the United States cannot be forced to grant a license to a privatized ISO (should the ISO change its treaty status and incorporate in a country) or to a future privatized affiliate, subsidiary or other form of spin-off from the ISO. Existing U.S. communications and antitrust law, regulation, policy and practice will continue to apply to license applicants if a GBT deal goes into effect. Both Department of Justice and FCC precedent evidence long-standing concerns about competition in the U.S. market and actions to protect that competition. We have made it clear to all our negotiating partners in the WTO that the United States will not grant market access to a future privatized affiliate, subsidiary or other form of spin-off from the ISOs, that would likely lead to anti-competitive results.

It has always been U.S. practice to defend vigorously any challenge in the WTO to allegations that U.S. measures are inconsistent with our WTO obligations. There is no question that we would do the same for any FCC decision to deny or condition a license to access an ISO or a future privatized affiliate, subsidiary or other form of spin-off from the ISO. For your information, Section 102(c) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, specifically denies a private right of action in U.S. courts on the basis of a WTO agreement. Therefore, a FCC decision is not subject to judicial review in U.S. courts based upon a WTO agreement, such as the General Agreement on Trade in Services.

The United States is confident that it would win if a U.S. decision went to WTO dispute settlement. If the United States did not prevail, however, we would not allow trade retaliation measures to deter us from protecting the integrity of U.S. competition policy.

I appreciate the support your firms' representatives have expressed for our objectives in the WTO negotiations.

Sincerely,



Charlene Barshefsky
United States Trade Representative-Designate

cc: Chairman Reed Hundt, Federal Communications Commission

FCC Secretary William F. Caton for inclusion in the rulemaking proceeding concerning the Commission's Regulatory Policies to Allow Non-U.S.-Licensed Space Stations to Provide Domestic and International Satellite Service in the United States (FCC 96-210, released May 14, 1996)

Daniel S. Goldberg, Counsel to PanAmSat

Raul R. Rodriguez, Counsel to Columbia Communications Corporation

April McClain-Delaney, Counsel to Orion Network Systems, Inc.